

Distorted sums of models.

BY

SHMUEL LIFSCHES and SAHARON SHELAH*

Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

Abstract.

Distorted sums of models were introduced and discussed in [Sh2]. This notion generalizes the notion of disjoint (or direct) sums of models by letting the summands overlap.

In the first section we investigate types in distorted sums and show that the type of a sequence of elements $\bar{a}$ is determined by the ‘local’ type of $\bar{a}$ (i.e. the type restricted to a neighborhood of $\bar{a}$). We simplify the proofs in [Sh] and improve the bounds on the radii needed to determine the types.

Natural examples of distorted sums are models with distant functions. In the second and third sections we discuss such models and improve a theorem by Gaifman ([Ga]), that states that each formula is equivalent to a boolean combination of local formulas.

* The second author would like to thank the U.S.–Israel Binational Science Foundation for partially supporting this research. Publ. 603

1. Distorted sums of models.

In this section we define distorted sums of models and prove the distorted sum lemma stating that types of elements are decomposed into local types and “locational” types in proper expansions.

Context: All languages are finite and relational.

$\bar{a}$ denotes a finite sequence $\langle a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1} \rangle$ and $\lg(\bar{a})$ its length. We will freely write $a_0 \in \bar{a}$ and $\bar{a} \subseteq M$ as if $\bar{a}$ is a set. $\bar{a} \wedge \langle b \rangle$ and $\bar{a} \wedge b$ denote $\langle a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1}, b \rangle$.

$\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ denote models and M, I their universe.

The following definitions are as in [Sh1] §2.

Definition 1.1. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a τ -model and $\bar{a} \subseteq M$.

1. $\text{Th}(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ is the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}) : \varphi \in \mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a})\}$.
2. The n -type of $\bar{a}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ or the n -theory of $(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$, $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ is defined by induction on n :
 $\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ is the set $\{\varphi(\bar{x}) : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}), \varphi \text{ quantifier free}\}$;
 $\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ is the set $\{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M\}$.
3. $\mathcal{T}_{n,\ell}^\tau$ is the set $\{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a}) : \mathcal{M} \text{ a } \tau\text{-model}, \bar{a} \subseteq M, \lg(\bar{a}) = \ell\}$. (It is finite when τ is).
4. When $\bar{a} \not\subseteq M$, $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ is $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \cap M)$ (and we understand it as including the information which members of $\bar{a}$ belong to M).

Clearly for every formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ there is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $\mathcal{M}$ and $\bar{a} \subseteq M$, we can determine whether $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a})$ from $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$.

Definition 1.2. We say that $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathcal{L}_\tau$ is of *depth* n and write $\text{dp}(\varphi) = n$ if n is minimal with the above property.

Now $\text{dp}(\varphi(\bar{x})) = 0$ iff $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is quantifier free, and $\text{dp}(\varphi(\bar{x})) = n + 1$ iff $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is (equivalent to a formula) of the form $\bigwedge_{i \in I} \pm(\exists y)[\psi_i(\bar{x}, y)]$ where for $i \in I$ $\text{dp}(\psi_i) \leq n$ and for some $i_0 \in I$ $\text{dp}(\psi_{i_0}) = n$. ($\pm\psi$ means ψ or $\neg\psi$).

We also have for every $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathcal{T}_{n,\ell}^\tau$ some formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ such that $\text{dp}(\varphi) = n$ and for every $\mathcal{M}$ and $\bar{a} \subseteq M$, $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(\bar{a}) \iff \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a}) = \mathfrak{t}$. (See [Sh1] lemma 2.10).

A distorted sum of models is a model whose universe is a distorted union:

Notation 1.3. Let (I, d) be a metric space and $\{A_t : t \in I\}$ be pairwise disjoint. For $t \in I$ let $M_t := \cup\{A_s : d(t, s) \leq 1\}$.

$M = \cup_{t \in I}^d M_t$ ($= \cup_{t \in I} A_t$) is called the *distorted union* of the M_t 's.

For $a \in A$ define $h(a)$ to be the unique $t \in I$ such that $a \in A_t$. $h(\bar{a})$ is $\langle h(a_0), \dots, h(a_{r-1}) \rangle$.

Conventions. (i) From now on (I, d) will be a metric space and $\mathcal{I}$ a model with universe I . M is $\cup_{t \in I}^d M_t$ and $h: M \rightarrow I$ as above.

(ii) a, b, c, d denote elements in M and s, t, u, v elements in I , usually $h(a) = s$ and $h(b) = t$.

(iii) When $M \cap I \neq \emptyset$ we stipulate $h(t) = t$ for $t \in M \cap I$.

(iv) $d(a, b)$ for $a, b \in M$ is $d(h(a), h(b))$, $d(a, t)$ for $a \in M$ and $t \in I$ is $d(h(a), t)$.

(v) $d(\bar{t}, s) \leq k$ means $d(t_i, s) \leq k$ for some $t_i \in \bar{t}$. $d(\bar{t}, s) > k$ means $\neg d(\bar{t}, s) \leq k$.

Definition 1.4 (Distorted Sum of Models). Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a τ_0 -model and d a metric on I . Let, for $t \in I$, $\mathcal{M}_t$ be a τ_1 -model. We say that a τ_2 -model $\mathcal{M}$ is the d -distorted F -sum of $\{\mathcal{M}_t : t \in I\}$ and write $\mathcal{M} = \sum_{t \in I}^{d, F} \mathcal{M}_t$ if

- (a) M is a disjoint union of some $\{A_t : t \in I\}$,
- (b) $M_t = \cup \{A_s : s \in I, d(t, s) \leq 1\}$ for each $t \in I$,
- (c) if $\bar{b} = \langle b_0, \dots, b_{r-1} \rangle \subseteq M$, then

$$\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}; \bar{b}) = F\left(\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{I}; h(\bar{b})), \dots, \text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}_{h(b_\ell)}; \bar{b}), \dots\right)_{\ell < r}.$$

Remark. Assuming $s \neq t \Rightarrow d(s, t) > 1$ we see that a direct sum of models is an instance of the above definition.

We define now some neighborhoods of finite sequences of elements and the notion of an n -component. These will be needed in formulating the distorted sum lemma.

Definition 1.5. (i) Let $J \subseteq I$ (usually finite). Define a binary relation E_J^n on J by

$$E_J^n(t, s) \iff (\exists u_0, \dots, u_k \in J)(u_0 = t \ \& \ u_k = s \ \& \ (i < k \Rightarrow d(u_i, u_{i+1}) \leq 2^n).$$

(ii) Call $J' \subseteq J$ an (n, J) -component if $[s, t \in J'] \Rightarrow E_J^n(t, s)$.

(iii) We say that J is an n -component if $[s, t \in J] \Rightarrow E_J^n(t, s)$.

(iv) $\langle a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1} \rangle$ is an n -component if $\langle h(a_0), \dots, h(a_{\ell-1}) \rangle$ is.

(v) Suppose $\langle a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1} \rangle \subseteq M$, and $h(a_i) = s_i$ for $i < \ell$. Define $M^n(\bar{a}) \subseteq I \cup M$ by

$$M^n(\bar{a}) := \{t \in I : (\exists i < \ell)[d(s_i, t) \leq 2^n]\} \cup \bigcup \{M_t : (\exists i < \ell)[d(s_i, t) \leq 2^n]\}.$$

we shall not distinguish between $M^n(\bar{a})$, $M^n(\bar{s})$ and even $M^n(a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-2}, s_{\ell-1})$.

Facts 1.6. (i) E_J^n is an equivalence relation on J , hence when J is finite there is a unique (up to permutations) partition $J = J^0 \cup J^1 \dots \cup J^{r-1}$ into n -components, with r minimal.

(ii) E_J^{n-1} refines E_J^n .

Proof. Clear.

♡

We will call a decomposition as in (i) above a *minimal decomposition into n -components*.

Notation. For $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ define $\alpha(n, \ell)$ by recursion: $\alpha(0, \ell) = 0$ and $\alpha(n, \ell) = \alpha(n-1, \ell+1) + \ell + 2$ for $n > 0$.

Definition 1.7. Let $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\bar{a} = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1} \rangle \subseteq M$. The models $\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a})$ and $\mathcal{I}^{n, \ell}$ are defined as follows:

(A) $\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a})$ is the model with universe $M^n(\bar{a})$ and with the signature τ_1^n consisting of the following relations:

(i) restrictions of the relations of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ i.e. for every $R \in \tau_1$ we let

$$Q_1^{R, n} = \{ \langle c_0, \dots, c_{k-1} \rangle \subseteq M^n(\bar{a}) \cap M : \mathcal{M} \models R(\bar{c}) \},$$

and for every $R \in \tau_0$ we let

$$Q_0^{R, n} = \{ \langle t_0, \dots, t_{k-1} \rangle \subseteq M^n(\bar{a}) \cap I : \mathcal{I} \models R(\bar{t}) \};$$

(ii) distances i.e. for each $k \leq 2^n$

$$D^{k, n} = \{ \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle : x_1, x_2 \in M^n(\bar{a}), d(x_1, x_2) \leq k \},$$

(iii) the graph of h i.e.

$$H = \{ \langle c, u \rangle : c, u \in M^n(\bar{a}), h(c) = u \};$$

(iv) unary predicates expressing $x \in M$ and $x \in I$.

$\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{b})$ is equal to $\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a})$ when $h(\bar{a}) = h(\bar{b})$. $\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{s})$ is $\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a})$ when $h(\bar{a}) = \bar{s}$.

(B) $\mathcal{I}^{n, \ell}$ is the model with universe I and with signature $\tau_0^{n, \ell}$ defined by induction on n . $\tau_0^{0, \ell}$ is τ_0 and for $n \geq 1$ $\tau_0^{n, \ell}$ is $\tau_0^{n-1, \ell+1}$ and the following relations:

(i) distorted Feferman-Vaught predicates $R_{n, k, \ell}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ for $k \leq \ell$ where $R_{n, k, \ell}^{\mathfrak{t}}(u_0, \dots, u_{k-1}, u_k)$ holds iff $\langle u_0, \dots, u_k \rangle$ is an n -component and there exist $c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}$ in M such that $h(c_i) = u_i$ for $i < k$ and

$$\text{Th}^{\alpha(n-1, \ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{u}); c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}, u_k) = \mathfrak{t};$$

(ii) distances i.e. for $k \leq 2^n$

$$D^k = \{ \langle s, t \rangle \in I^2 : d(s, t) \leq k \}.$$

The next facts are used in the proof of the distorted sum lemma.

Fact 1.8. Let $n, m, \ell, r \in \mathbb{N}$.

(i) Let $\bar{x} = \langle x_0, \dots, x_{r-1} \rangle \subseteq M \cup I$. From $\mathfrak{t} := \text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{M}^{m+1}(\bar{x}); \bar{x})$ one can effectively compute $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}^{m+1}(\bar{x}); \bar{x})$, $\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{M}^m(\bar{x}); \bar{x})$ and $\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{M}^{m+1}(\bar{x}'); \bar{x}')$ for every $\bar{x}' \subseteq \bar{x}$. Moreover, from

$\mathbf{t}$ one can compute a minimal decomposition $\bar{x}^0, \dots, \bar{x}^{k-1}$ of $\bar{x}$ into m -components and the theories $\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{M}^m(\bar{x}^i); \bar{x}^i)$ for $i < k$.

(ii) Let $\bar{s} = \langle s_0, \dots, s_{r-1} \rangle \subseteq I$. From $\mathbf{s} := \text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{m+1, \ell}; \bar{s})$ one can effectively compute $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{m+1, \ell}; \bar{s})$, $\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{m, \ell+1}; \bar{s})$ and the set $\{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{m+1, \ell}; \bar{s} \wedge t) : \text{pr}(t)\}$ where $\text{pr}(t)$ is a statement of the form $d(\bar{s}, t) \leq k$ or $d(\bar{s}, t) > k$ for $k \leq 2^{m+1}$.

Proof. Easy. The main facts that are used are that distances $\leq 2^{m+1}$ are given by formulas of depth 0 and that τ_1^{m+1} and $\tau_0^{n+1, \ell}$ are richer than τ_1^m and $\tau_0^{n, \ell+1}$ respectively.

♡

The distorted sum lemma states that for every $\bar{a} \subseteq M$ of length ℓ , the n -theory of $\bar{a}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ can be computed from the local theories of the n -components of $\bar{a}$ and the theory of $h(\bar{a})$ in $\mathcal{I}^{n, \ell}$.

Lemma 1.9 (The Distorted Sum Lemma). Let $\mathcal{M} = \sum_{t \in I}^{d, F} \mathcal{M}_t$ be a distorted sum of models. For every $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a function $F_{n, \ell}$ such that if $\bar{a} = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1} \rangle \subseteq M$, and $\bar{a}^0, \dots, \bar{a}^{r-1}$ is a minimal decomposition of $\bar{a}$ into n -components then

$$\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a}) = F_{n, \ell}(\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n, \ell}; h(\bar{a})), \dots, \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}^{\alpha(n, \ell)}(\bar{a}^i); \bar{a}^i), \dots)_{i < r}.$$

Proof. We will prove the existence of $F_{n, \ell}$ by induction on n and for every ℓ .

$F_{0, \ell}$ is F from the definition of distorted sums.

Let $\bar{a} = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1} \rangle \subseteq M$ and $\bar{a}^0, \dots, \bar{a}^{r-1}$ be a minimal decomposition into $(n+1)$ -components. Suppose now that $F_{n, \ell+1}$ exists, denote $h(a_i) = s_i$. Now we would like to compute $\mathbf{t} = \text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ from the data

$$\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{n+1, \ell}; \bar{s}), \dots, \text{Th}^{\alpha(n+1, \ell)}(\mathcal{M}^{n+1}(\bar{a}^i); \bar{a}^i), \dots (i < r).$$

Represent $\mathbf{t} = \{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M\} = T_1 \cup T_2$ where

$$T_1 = \{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M, b \notin \cup_{i < r} M^n(\bar{a}^i)\}$$

and

$$T_2 = \{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M, b \in \cup_{i < r} M^n(\bar{a}^i)\}$$

and let's compute T_1 and T_2 separately.

T_1 : When $b \notin \cup_{i < r} M^n(\bar{a}^i)$, $d(\bar{a}, b) > 2^n$. Therefore a minimal decomposition of $\bar{a} \wedge b$ into n -components refines $\bar{a}^0, \dots, \bar{a}^{r-1}, \langle b \rangle$. Let $\langle \langle b \rangle, \dots, \bar{a}^{i, j}, \dots \rangle_{i < r, j < k_i}$ be a minimal n -decomposition of $\bar{a} \wedge b$. Denote $h(b) = t$. By the induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) &= \\ &= F_{n, \ell+1}(\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n, \ell+1}; \bar{s} \wedge t), \text{Th}^{\alpha(n, \ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(b); b), \dots, \text{Th}^{\alpha(n, \ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a}^{i, j}); \bar{a}^{i, j}), \dots), \end{aligned}$$

therefore for computing T_1 it is enough to compute the set of possibilities

$$T_1^* := \{ \langle \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n,\ell+1}; \bar{s} \wedge t), \text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(b); b), \dots, \text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a}^{i,j}); \bar{a}^{i,j}), \dots \rangle : \\ d(\bar{s}, t) > 2^n, b \in h^{-1}(t) \}.$$

Our data includes $\text{Th}^{\alpha(n+1,\ell)}(\mathcal{M}^{n+1}(\bar{a}^i); \bar{a}^i)$ for $i < r$ and by 1.8(i) (as $\alpha(n+1, \ell) > \alpha(n, \ell+1)$), from each such theory we can compute a minimal refinement into n -components $\bar{a}^{i,0}, \dots, \bar{a}^{i,k_i-1}$ and the theories $\text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a}^{i,j}); \bar{a}^{i,j})$ for every $j < k_i$.

On the other hand $\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{n+1,\ell}; \bar{s})$ gives us $\{ \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n+1,\ell}; \bar{s} \wedge t) : d(\bar{s}, t) > 2^n \}$ and from this we can compute $\{ \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n,\ell+1}; \bar{s} \wedge t) : d(\bar{s}, t) > 2^n \}$ (by 1.8(ii)). From each $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n+1,\ell}; \bar{s} \wedge t)$, using the predicates $R_{n+1,0,\ell}^{\mathbf{t}}$ in $\tau_0^{n+1,\ell}$ we can compute the set $\{ \text{Th}^{\alpha(n+1,\ell)}(\mathcal{M}^n(t); t) : t \in I \}$ hence (as the graph of h is part of τ_1^n) the set $\{ \text{Th}^{\alpha(n+1,\ell)-1}(\mathcal{M}^n(t); t, b) : t \in I, h(t) = b \}$ and hence $\{ \text{Th}^{\alpha(n+1,\ell)-1}(\mathcal{M}^n(t); b) : h(t) = b \}$. As $\alpha(n+1, \ell) - 1 > \alpha(n, \ell+1)$ we can get $\{ \text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(t); b) : h(t) = b \}$. Together we get T_1^* .

T_2 : Let $b \in M$ and $h(b) = t$. Suppose that for some $k < \ell$ we have $d(t_k, s) \leq 2^n$ and that $a_k \in \bar{a}^i$ then a minimal n -decomposition of $\bar{a} \wedge b$ refines $\bar{a}^0, \dots, \bar{a}^i \wedge b, \dots, \bar{a}^{r-1}$.

Let's assume for simplicity that $\bar{a}^0 \wedge \bar{a}^1, \bar{a}^2 \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{a}^{r-1}$ is a minimal $(n+1)$ -decomposition of $\bar{a}$ and that $\bar{a}^0, \bar{a}^1, \bar{a}^2, \dots, \bar{a}^{r-1}$ is a minimal n -decomposition of $\bar{a}$. We will show that we are able to compute

$$T := \{ \langle \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n,\ell+1}; \bar{s} \wedge t), \text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a}^0 \wedge b); \bar{a}^0 \wedge b), \text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a}^1); \bar{a}^1), \dots \rangle : \\ t \in I, b \in h^{-1}(t), \bar{a}^0 \wedge b, \bar{a}^1, \dots \text{ is a minimal } n\text{-decomposition of } \bar{a} \wedge b \}.$$

Clearly computing T_2 can be reduced to computing a set like T (and then using $F_{n,\ell+1}$ that exists by the induction hypothesis).

Now $\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{n+1,\ell}; \bar{s})$ gives us the set

$$\{ \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n+1,\ell}; \bar{s} \wedge t) : \bar{s}^0 \wedge t, \bar{s}^1, \bar{s}^2, \dots \text{ is a minimal } n\text{-decomposition of } \bar{s} \wedge t \}$$

for each t as above, the theories $\text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a}^i); \bar{a}^i)$ for $0 < i < r$ are fixed and computable from $\text{Th}^{\alpha(n+1,\ell)}(\mathcal{M}^{n+1}(\bar{a}^0 \wedge \bar{a}^1); \bar{a}^0 \wedge \bar{a}^1)$ and $\text{Th}^{\alpha(n+1,\ell)}(\mathcal{M}^{n+1}(\bar{a}^2 \wedge \bar{a}^3 \dots); \bar{a}^2 \wedge \bar{a}^3 \dots)$ which are part of the data, so we only have to compute

$$\{ \langle \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n,\ell+1}; \bar{s} \wedge t), \text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a}^0 \wedge b); \bar{a}^0 \wedge b) \rangle : b \in h^{-1}(t) \}.$$

Therefore, given t it is enough to compute the set $\{ \text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a}^0 \wedge b); \bar{a}^0 \wedge b) : b \in h^{-1}(t) \}$ from $\mathbf{s} = \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n+1,\ell}; \bar{s} \wedge t)$. (All the possible $\mathbf{s}$'s as well as $\mathbf{s}^- := \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n,\ell+1}; \bar{s} \wedge t)$ are given by the datum $\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{n+1,\ell}; \bar{s})$).

Now $\text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{a}^0 \wedge b); \bar{a}^0 \wedge b)$ belongs to this set if and only if there exists $t^* \in M^{n+1}(\bar{a}^0)$ such that $h(t^*) = b$, $d(\bar{s}^0, t^*) \leq 2^n$ and for every $\bar{c}^0 \subseteq M^n(\bar{a}^0)$ with $h(\bar{c}^0) = h(\bar{a}^0)$,

$$\mathbf{t} = \text{Th}^{\alpha(n,\ell+1)}(\mathcal{M}^n(\bar{s}^0 \wedge t^*); \bar{c}^0, t^*) \text{ iff } \mathcal{I}^{n+1,\ell} \models R_{n+1,\ell}^{\mathbf{t}}(\bar{s}^0, t).$$

This can certainly be computed from $\text{Th}^{\alpha(n+1,\ell)}(\mathcal{M}^{n+1}(\bar{s}^0); \bar{a}^0)$ as $\text{lg}(\bar{s}^0) \leq \ell$ and $\alpha(n+1, \ell) = \alpha(n, \ell+1) + \ell + 2$. So we are done.

♡

Remark. Comparing with [Sh2] §3 and §5, one sees that the size of the neighborhoods taken around a sequence $\bar{a} \subseteq M$ is improved to be a power of 2 ($\leq 2^{n+\text{lg}(\bar{a})}$) rather than a power of 3.

One instance in which the distorted sum lemma is of no use is when $M=I$ and for $t \in I$ $A_t = \{t\}$. In this case $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n,\ell}; h(\bar{a}))$ is stronger than $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ and computing the second theory from the first one is pointless. We will formulate an abstract version of the distorted sum lemma (in which $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{I}^{n,\ell}; h(\bar{a}))$ is simplified) and prove in the next sections that the setup can be realized and applied in the context of models with distance functions.

Context. Let $\langle \beta(n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ and $\langle m(n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ be strictly increasing, satisfying $\beta(n) \geq n$ and $2^{m(n+1)} \geq 3 \cdot 2^{m(n)}$ ($m(n) = 2n$ will be used later).

The following definition (and the lemma below) assume that we have fixed $\langle \beta(n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ and $\langle m(n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$.

Definition 1.10. Let $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\bar{s} = \langle s_0, \dots, s_{\ell-1} \rangle \subseteq I$. The model $\mathcal{I}^n$ and the theory $\text{DTh}^k(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{s})$ are defined as follows:

(A) $\mathcal{I}^0$ is $\mathcal{I}$ and for $n \geq 1$ $\mathcal{I}^n$ is the model with universe I and with signature τ_0^n consisting of τ_0 and distorted unary Feferman-Vaught predicates $Q_n^{\mathfrak{t}}$ where $Q_n^{\mathfrak{t}}(u)$ holds iff and there exists $c \in M$ such that $h(c) = u$ and

$$\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(u); c) = \mathfrak{t}.$$

(B) $\text{DTh}^0(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{s})$ is $\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{s})$ and

$$\text{DTh}^{k+1}(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{s}) := \left\{ \langle \text{DTh}^k(\mathcal{I}^{n-1}; \bar{s} \wedge t), \text{Th}^0(\mathcal{I}^{n-1}; \bar{s} \wedge t) \rangle : d(\bar{s}, t) > 2^{m(k)} \right\}$$

($\mathcal{I}^{-n}$ for $n \geq 1$ is $\mathcal{I}^0$).

So $\text{DTh}^k(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{s})$ describes elements that are distant from $\bar{s}$. Note that $\mathcal{I}^{n+1}$ is richer than $\mathcal{I}^n$ (if $\beta(n+1)$ is big enough), however in general there is no reason to assume that $\text{DTh}^k(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{s})$ is computable from $\text{DTh}^{k+1}(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{s})$.

Notation 1.11. When $\bar{x} = \langle x_0, \dots, x_{\ell-1} \rangle$ and $\bar{y}$ are in $M \cup I$, we define

$$\bar{\text{Th}}^n(\mathcal{M}^m(\bar{x}); \bar{y}) := \langle \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}^m(x_0); \bar{y}), \dots, \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}^m(x_{\ell-1}); \bar{y}) \rangle.$$

Lemma 1.12 (The Distorted Sum Lemma – Abstract Version). *Let $\mathcal{M} = \sum_{t \in I}^{d,F} \mathcal{M}_t$ be a distorted sum of models. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a function F_n such that if $\bar{a} \subseteq M$, then*

$$\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a}) = F_n(\text{DTh}^n(\mathcal{I}^n; h(\bar{a})), \bar{\text{Th}}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(\bar{a}); \bar{a}))$$

provided that: for every $k \leq n$ and for every $\bar{a}$ and b in M with $d(\bar{a}, b) \leq 2^{m(k-1)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bigotimes_n \text{DTh}^{k-1}(\mathcal{I}^{k-1}; h(\bar{a}) \wedge h(b)) \text{ is computable from} \\ \text{DTh}^k(\mathcal{I}^k; h(\bar{a})) \text{ and } \bar{\text{Th}}^{\beta(k)-1}(\mathcal{M}^{m(k-1)}(\bar{a}); \bar{a} \wedge b). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By induction on n . F_0 is given by the definition of distorted sum of models (and we may choose $\beta(0) = m(0) = 0$).

Let $\bar{a} = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1} \rangle$ be given. Assuming $\bigotimes_{n+1}$ and the existence of F_n we would like to compute $\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ from $\text{DTh}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{n+1}; h(\bar{a}))$ and $\bar{\text{Th}}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n+1)}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$.

As before, we partition $\{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M\} = \text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ into $T_1 \cup T_2$ where

$$T_1 = \{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M, b \notin M^{m(n)}(\bar{a})\}$$

and

$$T_2 = \{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M, b \in M^{m(n)}(\bar{a})\}$$

and compute T_1 and T_2 separately.

If $b \notin M^{m(n)}(\bar{a})$ then $d(\bar{a}, b) > 2^{m(n)}$ hence

$$\bar{\text{Th}}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(\bar{a} \wedge b) = \bar{\text{Th}}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(\bar{a}); \bar{a}) \wedge \text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(b); b).$$

This sequence is computed from the datum $\bar{\text{Th}}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n+1)}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ and from $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(b); b)$. Now $\text{DTh}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{n+1}; h(\bar{a}))$ gives us the set of possibilities

$$\{\langle \text{DTh}^n(\mathcal{I}^n; h(\bar{a}) \wedge t), \text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(b); b) \rangle : b \in h^{-1}(t), d(h(\bar{a}), t) > 2^{m(n)}\}$$

And now we use F_n to compute T_1 .

For computing T_2 it is clearly enough to show how to compute

$$T_2^* = \{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M, b \in M^{m(n)}(a_0)\}.$$

Let $b \in M^{m(n)}(a_0)$ and $i < \ell$ be given. If it happens that $d(a_0, a_i) \leq 2 \cdot 2^{m(n)}$ then (as $2^{m(n+1)} \geq 3 \cdot 2^{m(n)}$), $M^{m(n)}(a_i) \subseteq M^{m(n+1)}(a_0)$. On the other hand, if $d(a_0, a_i) > 2 \cdot 2^{m(n)}$ then we must have $d(b, a_i) > 2^{m(n)}$ i.e. $b \notin M^{m(n)}(a_i)$ and $a_i \notin M^{m(n)}(b)$.

Therefore we can compute $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(a_i); \bar{a} \wedge b)$ from $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n+1)}(a_0); \bar{a} \wedge b)$ when a_i is close to a_0 , and from $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n+1)}(a_i); \bar{a})$ when a_i is distant from a_0 (and we know which of the

possibilities holds from $\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}^{m(n+1)}(a_0); \bar{a})$. Similarly, we can compute $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(b); \bar{a} \wedge b)$ from $\text{Th}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n+1)}(a_0); \bar{a} \wedge b)$.

To sum up, the datum $\mathbf{Th}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n+1)}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ gives us the set of possibilities

$$\{\langle \mathbf{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(\bar{a} \wedge b); \bar{a} \wedge b), \mathbf{Th}^{\beta(n+1)-1}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(\bar{a}); \bar{a} \wedge b) \rangle : d(a_0, b) \leq 2^{m(n)}\}$$

and using the datum $\text{DTh}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{n+1}; h(\bar{a}))$, the assumption $\otimes_{n+1}$ and the existence of F_n , we get T_2^* .

♡

2. Distant elements in metric spaces.

Here we are concerned with the problem of determining, in a given model, the existence of elements that are distant from a tuple $\bar{a}$ given the local theory of $\bar{a}$. From now on it will be more convenient to work with a new set of neighborhoods:

Notation 2.1. let (I, d) be a metric space and $\bar{a} \subseteq I$, we define

$$V^k(\bar{a}) := \{t \in I : d(\bar{a}, t) \leq k\}.$$

So our problem is the following: let (I, d) be a metric space and $\mathcal{I}$ be a τ_0 model with universe I (τ_0 is a finite relational signature). Suppose that $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ are ℓ -tuples of elements in I and let $C \subseteq I$ be a definable set such that there is some $c \in C$ with $d(\bar{a}, c) > m$. What size of neighborhoods $V^k(\bar{a})$ and $V^k(\bar{b})$ should we take around $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ in order to ensure that (for sufficiently large n)

$$\left(\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^k(\bar{a}); \bar{a}) = \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^k(\bar{b}); \bar{b}) \right) \Rightarrow (\exists e \in C)[d(\bar{b}, e) > m]$$

($\mathcal{V}^k(\bar{a})$ is the submodel with universe $V^k(\bar{a})$).

The answer, in the context below, is that diameter $3m$ suffices. The proof is basically given in [Ga], but the bound is slightly improved and shown to be a lower bound.

Context.

- (1) Distances up to $2m$ (i.e. “ $d(x, y) \leq k$ ” for $k \leq 2m$) as well as “ $c \in C$ ” are definable in $\mathcal{I}$.
- (2) $\mathcal{V}^k(\bar{a})$ computes correctly membership in C (e.g. when C is a unary predicate in τ_0) and distances up to $2m$.

Lemma 2.2. Let $\langle a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1} \rangle, \langle b_0, \dots, b_{\ell-1} \rangle \subseteq I$ and assume that (for a large enough n)

$$(*) \quad \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^{3m}(\bar{a}); \bar{a}) = \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^{3m}(\bar{b}); \bar{b})$$

and that $\mathcal{I} \models (\exists c \in C)[d(\bar{a}, c) > m]$.

Then $\mathcal{I} \models (\exists e \in C)[d(\bar{b}, e) > m]$.

Proof. First we ask: is there a ‘scattered’ sequence of length $\ell + 1$ i.e. is there a sequence $\langle c_0, \dots, c_\ell \rangle$ of elements of C such that $\wedge_{i < j \leq \ell} [d(c_i, c_j) > 2m]$? If the answer is positive then for each $i < \ell$ there is at most one $j \leq \ell$ such that $d(b_i, c_j) \leq m$ hence there is some $c \in C$ with $d(\bar{b}, c) > m$.

Otherwise let $k \leq \ell$ be maximal such that there is a scattered sequence of length k . Now ask: is there such a sequence in $V^m(\bar{a})$? If there is one, then, as a scattered sequence of length k can not be extended, all members of C are within distance of $\leq 3m$ from $\bar{a}$ i.e. in $V^{3m}(\bar{a})$. By the assumption, $V^{3m}(\bar{a})$ contains an element $c^* \in C$ such that $d(\bar{a}, c^*) > m$. $\text{Th}(\mathcal{V}^{3m}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ reflects this fact and by $(*)$ the same holds in $V^{3m}(\bar{b})$.

Lastly, suppose there is no scattered sequence of length k inside $V^m(\bar{a})$. By $(*)$ there isn’t one in $V^m(\bar{b})$. Necessarily there is an element of $e \in C$ such that $d(\bar{b}, e) > m$ (because a scattered sequence of length k exists somewhere in I).

♡

Remark. The depth n of the local theory $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^k(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ depends on $\text{lg}(\bar{a})$, the depth of “ $c \in C$ ” and the depth of “ $d(x, y) \leq 2m$ ”.

Let us show now that $3m$ is the minimal diameter that is needed to take in order to ensure the existence of distant elements. For a graph (G, R) let $d(x, y)$ be the natural distance function defined by $d(x, y) = 0$ iff $x = y$ and $(\exists u_0, \dots, u_n)[x = u_0 \ \& \ y = u_n \ \& \ \wedge_{i < n} u_i R u_{i+1}] \Rightarrow d(x, y) \leq n$.

Example 2.3. Let (G, R) be an infinite graph. Let $C \subseteq G$ be an infinite subset such that for every $c \in C$ $\{e \in C : d(c, e) = k\}$ is infinite for $k = 1, 2$ and such that $d(c, e) \leq 2$ for every $c, e \in C$. Suppose $a, b \in G \setminus C$ satisfy:

- (i) $d(a, c) \leq 1$ for every $c \in C$ except for a unique $c^* \in C$ that satisfies $d(a, c^*) = 3$, and
- (ii) $d(b, c) \leq 1$ for every $c \in C$.

When τ_0 consists only of the graph relation R and the unary predicate C we have $\text{Th}(\mathcal{V}^2(a); a) = \text{Th}(\mathcal{V}^2(b); b)$ but no element of C has distance > 1 from b . We need to take $V^3(a)$ and $V^3(b)$ to distinguish between the theories.

3. Models with a distance function.

As an application we will consider models with a distance function and improve a theorem by Gaifman ([Ga]).

Context 3.1. Let τ be a finite, relational signature. When $\mathcal{M}$ is a τ -model we can define a distance function d between the elements of M as follows:

$$d(a, b) = 0 \text{ iff } a = b,$$

$d(a, b) \leq 1$ iff for some predicate $R \in \tau$ (including equality) and some tuple $\bar{c} \in M$ containing both a and b , $\mathcal{M} \models R(\bar{c})$,

$d(a, b) \leq n + 1$ iff for some $c \in M$ $d(a, c) \leq n$ and $d(c, b) \leq 1$,

$d(a, b) = n$ iff $d(a, b) \leq n$ and $d(a, b) \not\leq n - 1$,

$d(a, b) = \infty$ iff $d(a, b) \not\leq n$ for all n .

If all the relations in τ are binary then $d(a, b) = 1$ is expressible by a quantifier free formula and (by induction) $d(a, b) \leq 2^n$ and $d(a, b) > 2^n$ are expressible by formulas of depth n . In general, if k is the maximal arity of the relations in τ then $d(a, b) \leq 2^n$ and $d(a, b) > 2^n$ are expressible by formulas of depth $n + k - 2$.

Representing a model with a distance function as a distorted sum of models: Let $\mathcal{M}$ be as above, and for $b \in M$ let $A_b = \{b\}$ and $M_b = \{a \in M : d(b, a) \leq 1\}$. Clearly M is the distorted union of $\{M_b : b \in M\}$ and as by the definition of d there is a function F such that $\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}; \bar{b}) = F(\dots, \text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}_{b_i}; \bar{b}), \dots)_{i < \text{lg}(\bar{b})}$. Therefore $\mathcal{M} = \sum_{b \in M}^{d, F} \mathcal{M}_b$, (the function h is of course the identity).

As $M = I$ we are not interested in the main version (1.9) of the distorted sum lemma, however the abstract version of the distorted sum lemma is applicable in a slightly modified form.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\langle \beta(n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ and $\langle m(n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ be strictly increasing, satisfying $\beta(n) \geq n$ and $2^{m(n+1)} \geq 3 \cdot 2^{m(n)}$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a τ -model with a distance function defined as above.*

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a function F_n such that if $\bar{a} \subseteq M$, then

$$\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a}) = F_n(\text{DTh}^n(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{a}), \text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a}))$$

provided that: for every $k \leq n$ and for every $\bar{a}$ and b in M with $d(\bar{a}, b) \leq 2^{m(k-1)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bigotimes_n \text{DTh}^{k-1}(\mathcal{I}^{k-1}; \bar{a} \wedge b) \text{ is computable from} \\ \text{DTh}^k(\mathcal{I}^k; \bar{a}) \text{ and } \text{Th}^{\beta(k)-1}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(k-1)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a} \wedge b). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of lemma 1.12. The only difference is that we replaced the sequence $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ with (the stronger theory) $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$.

♡

Remark. We shall see below that $\text{DTh}^n(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{a})$ is in fact determined by $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ so it can be eliminated.

Definition 3.3. $\varphi(x_0, \dots, x_{m-1})$ is a k -local formula if it is (equivalent to) a formula where all the quantifiers are of the form $(\exists u \in V^k(\bar{x}))$ and $(\forall u \in V^k(\bar{x}))$. We denote k -local formulas by $\varphi^{(k)}(\bar{x})$.

Gaifman's theorem states that in our context all formulas are equivalent to Boolean combinations of local formulas.

Theorem 3.4 (Gaifman). *Every first order formula $\alpha(u_0, \dots, u_{m-1})$ is logically equivalent to a Boolean combination of*

(I) *Sentences of the form*

$$(\exists v_0, \dots, v_{s-1}) [\bigwedge_{i < s} \psi^{(r)}(v_i) \ \& \ \bigwedge_{i < j < s} d(v_i, v_j) > 2r]$$

where $\psi^{(r)}(v_i)$ is obtained from $\psi^{(r)}(v_j)$ by substituting v_i for v_j .

(II) *Local formulas of the form $\varphi^{(t)}(\bar{w})$ where $\bar{w} \subseteq \bar{u}$.*

Moreover, if the quantifier depth of $\alpha(\bar{u})$ is n then the following inequalities can be guaranteed:

$$r \leq 7^{n-1}, \quad s \leq m + n, \quad t \leq \frac{1}{2}(7^n - 1).$$

If α is a sentence then only sentences of the form (I) occur.

We improve of Gaifman's theorem by replacing the exponent of 7 by an exponent of 4.

Basically we are interested in computing the diameter $k(n) = 2^{m(n)}$ that can be used in lemma 3.2. We show that $k(n)$ can be chosen to be equal to $3 \cdot 4^{n-1}$. The depths $\beta(n)$ are not specified and we shall write occasionally $\text{Th}(\dots)$ instead of $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\dots)$. In general this can be construed as a theory that is rich enough to express the relevant distances (this depends of course on the arity of the relations in τ).

Fact 3.5. *Let $\bar{a} = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1} \rangle \subseteq M$ and $b \in M$.*

For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{Th}^{n^*}(\mathcal{V}^{3m+1}(\bar{a}); \bar{a} \wedge b)$ and $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^m(b); \bar{a} \wedge b)$ determine $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^m(\bar{a} \wedge b); \bar{a} \wedge b)$ hence $\langle \dots, \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^m(a_i); \bar{a} \wedge b), \dots, \text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^m(b); \bar{a} \wedge b) \rangle$.

(Here $n^* = n^*(n, m)$ is n + the depth needed to express distances up to m).

Proof. There are 2 cases: When $d(\bar{a}, b) \leq 2m+1$, $V^m(b) \subseteq V^{3m+1}(\bar{a})$ and $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^m(\bar{a} \wedge b); \bar{a} \wedge b)$ is determined by $\text{Th}^{n^*}(\mathcal{V}^{3m+1}(\bar{a}); \bar{a} \wedge b)$.

When $d(\bar{a}, b) > 2m+1$ for every relation $R \in \tau$, if $\mathcal{V}^m(\bar{a} \wedge b) \models R(\bar{c})$ then either $\bar{c} \subseteq V^m(\bar{a})$ or $\bar{c} \subseteq V^m(b)$. It follows that $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^m(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ and $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^m(b); b)$ determine $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{V}^m(\bar{a} \wedge b); \bar{a} \wedge b)$.

♡

Definition 3.6. Let $k(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ be minimal (if it exists) such that $\text{Th}(\mathcal{V}^{k(n)}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ determines $\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ for every $\mathcal{M}$ and $\bar{a} \subseteq M$.

Fact 3.7. (1) $k(n)$ exists for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$
(2) $k(0) = 1$ and $k(1) = 3$.

Proof. Gaifman's theorem gives us the existence of $k(n)$. $k(0) = 1$ is trivial. Given $\bar{a} \subseteq M$, $\text{Th}^1(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ is $\{\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M\}$. When $d(\bar{a}, b) \leq 1$ $\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b)$ is computable from $\text{Th}(\mathcal{V}^1(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$. When $d(\bar{a}, b) > 1$ then $\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b)$ can be computed from $\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a})$ and $\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{M}; b)$ where the latter can express only formulas of the form $R(b)$ for R a unary predicate in τ . One needs only to know if there exists a $b \in M$ with $d(\bar{a}, b) > 1$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models [R_1(b) \& R_2(b), \dots, \neg Q_1(b) \& \neg Q_2(b) \dots]$. $\text{Th}(\mathcal{V}^3(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ can supply this information by Lemma 2.2, $\text{Th}(\mathcal{V}^2(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ can't by example 2.3.

♡

Lemma 3.8. $k(n) \leq 3 \cdot 4^{n-1}$ for $n \geq 1$.

Proof. By induction on n where the case $n = 1$ is given above.
As before, we decompose $\text{Th}^{n+1}(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a}) = \{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M\}$ into

$$T_1 := \{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M, d(\bar{a}, b) \leq k(n)\}$$

and

$$T_2 := \{\text{Th}^n(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M, d(\bar{a}, b) > k(n)\}$$

and compute them separately.

Let $\beta(n+1)$ be $\beta(n)$ plus the depth required to define distances $\leq 2^{m(n+1)}$.

For computing T_1 it is enough, by the induction hypothesis, to find the minimal $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\text{Th}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{V}^k(\bar{a}); \bar{a}) \text{ determines } \{\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{V}^{k(n)}(\bar{a} \wedge b); \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M, d(\bar{a}, b) \leq k(n)\}.$$

Clearly $k = 2k(n)$ is as required.

For the second part we will use lemma 3.2. Let $m(0) = 0$, $m(1) = \log_2(3)$ and $m(n+2) = m(n+1) + 2$ so $\text{DTh}^n(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{a})$ describes elements of distance $> 3 \cdot 4^{n-1}$ from $\bar{a}$. We need this:

Subclaim. For every $n \geq 1$ $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ determines $\text{DTh}^n(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{a})$.

This is proved by induction on n , for every $\bar{a}$. The case $n = 0$ is clear. Assuming the subclaim for every $k \leq n$, we have to show that $\text{DTh}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{n+1}; \bar{a})$ is determined by $\text{Th}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n+1)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$.

Now $\text{DTh}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{n+1}; \bar{a})$ is the set of pairs $\langle \text{DTh}^n(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{s} \wedge t), \text{Th}^0(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{s} \wedge t) \rangle$ with $d(\bar{s}, t) > 2^{m(n)}$. To compute it we need to know $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(a_i); a_i)$ for $i < \lg(\bar{a})$, which is computable from $\text{Th}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n+1)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$. Next, let us ask, for each possible theory $\mathfrak{t}$, if there is $b \in \mathcal{M}$ with $d(\bar{a}, b) > 2^{m(n)} = 3 \cdot 4^{n-1}$ such that $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{m(n)}(b); b) = \mathfrak{t}$. Reading the proof of lemma 2.2 we see that this is determined by $\text{Th}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{V}^{3 \cdot 2^{m(n)} + 2^{m(n)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a}) = \text{Th}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n+1)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ (we have

to ‘see’ not only distant b ’s but also balls of radius $2^{m(n)}$ around them, hence the extra $2^{m(n)}$. So the possibilities for $\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{s} \wedge t)$ are determined.

Now by fact 3.5 having $\text{Th}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n+1)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ and $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n)}}(b); b)$ we can compute $\text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n)}}(\bar{a} \wedge b); \bar{a} \wedge b)$. By the induction hypothesis we get $\text{DTh}^n(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{a} \wedge b)$.

Therefore we can compute $\text{DTh}^n(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{a} \wedge b)$ from $\text{Th}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n+1)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ and $\text{Th}^0(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{a} \wedge b)$. Hence $\text{DTh}^{n+1}(\mathcal{I}^{n+1}; \bar{a})$ is determined as required.

Note that as $\text{Th}^{\beta(n+1)-1}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n+1)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ determines $\text{Th}^{\beta(k)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(k)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ for $k < n+1$, it determines $\text{DTh}^k(\mathcal{I}^k; \bar{a})$ as well.

Returning back to the main proof, we choose $k(n+1) = 4 \cdot k(n)$. By the subclaim and its proof $\text{Th}^{\beta(n+1)}(\mathcal{V}^{k(n+1)}(\bar{a}); \bar{a})$ determines the set

$$T^* = \{ \langle \text{Th}^{\beta(n)}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(n)}}(\bar{a} \wedge b); \bar{a} \wedge b), \text{DTh}^n(\mathcal{I}^n; \bar{a} \wedge b) \rangle : d(\bar{a}, b) > k(n) \}$$

where $m(n)$ is $\log_2(k(n))$. To apply lemma 3.2. we only have to check $\bigotimes_n$ however the fact that $\text{Th}^{\beta(r)-1}(\mathcal{V}^{2^{m(r)}}(\bar{a}); \bar{a} \wedge b)$ and $\text{DTh}^r(\mathcal{I}^r; \bar{a})$ (superfluous) determine $\text{DTh}^{r-1}(\mathcal{I}^{r-1}; \bar{a} \wedge b)$ when $d(\bar{a}, b) \leq 2^{m(n)}$ for $r \leq n$ follows immediately from the proof of the subclaim.

Therefore we may conclude that T^* determines the set

$$T_2 := \{ \text{Th}(\mathcal{M}; \bar{a} \wedge b) : b \in M, d(\bar{a}, b) > k(n) \}$$

This finishes the proof. ♡

Revisiting Gaifman’s theorem we get:

Theorem 3.9. *Every first order formula $\alpha(u_0, \dots, u_{m-1})$ is logically equivalent to a Boolean combination of*

(I) *Sentences of the form*

$$(\exists v_0, \dots, v_{s-1}) \left[\bigwedge_{i < s} \psi^{(r)}(v_i) \ \& \ \bigwedge_{i < j < s} d(v_i, v_j) > 2r \right]$$

where $\psi^{(r)}(v_i)$ is obtained from $\psi^{(r)}(v_j)$ by substituting v_i for v_j .

(II) *Local formulas of the form $(\exists x \in V^t(u_i))[\varphi(x, \bar{u})]$ for $i < \ell$.*

Moreover, if $n = \text{the depth of } \alpha(\bar{u})$ then the following inequalities can be guaranteed:

$$r \leq 3 \cdot 4^{n-1}, \quad s \leq m + n, \quad t \leq 3 \cdot 4^{n-1}.$$

If α is a sentence then only sentences of the form (I) occur. ♡

Let us just remark that (I) comes from asking (as in section 2) if there exists a scattered sequence of length m in M .

REFERENCES

- [FV] S. FEFERMAN and R. L. VAUGHT, *The first order properties of products of algebraic systems*, **Fund. Math.**, vol. 47 (1959) pp. 57–103.
- [Ga] H. GAIFMAN, *On Local and non local properties*, **Proceedings of the Herbrand symposium**, (J. Stern, editor), North Holland, Berlin 1982, pp. 105–140.
- [Gu] Y. GUREVICH, *Monadic Second-order Theories*, **Model Theoretic Logics**, (J. Barwise and S. Feferman, editors), Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1985, pp. 479–506.
- [Ma] L. MARKUS, *Minimal models of theories of one function symbol*, **Israel Journal of Mathematics**, vol. 18 (1974) pp. 117–131.
- [Mo] A. MOSTOWSKI, *On direct products of theories*, **The Journal of Symbolic Logic**, vol. 17 (1952) pp. 1–31.
- [Sh1] S. SHELAH, *The monadic theory of order*, **Annals of Mathematics**, vol. 102 (1975) pp. 379–419.
- [Sh2] S. SHELAH, *On very weak 0-1 laws for random graphs with orders*, **Journal of Logic and Computation**, vol. 6 no. 1 (1996) pp. 137–159.